

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au
To: [DPE_CSE_Pyrmont_Peninsula_Mailbox](#)
Cc: [DPE_PS_ePlanning_Exhibitions_Mailbox](#)
Subject: Webform submission from: Pyrmont Peninsula sub-precinct master plans
Date: Thursday, 3 February 2022 9:45:13 PM

Submitted on Thu, 03/02/2022 - 21:45

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Miriam

Last name

Goodwiin

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Pyrmont

Please provide your view on the project

I am just providing comments

Submission

This submission focuses largely on issues with specific transport elements of the Plan.

1. The waterfront end of Jones St is totally inappropriate for the ferry wharf proposed for Cadi Park. (Exhibition Discussion Paper Figure 18 and Urban Design Report pp7, 12, 13, 19, 50 etc.)

- This location does not and cannot connect directly to existing transport (e.g. the Jones St Square light rail and Harris St for buses). That is hardly consistent with existing public infrastructure use and integration (Report, p1p8, 50). There is no bus stop on Bowman St currently and the two levels of steps to get down to it from Bowman are steep (which is not evident in a 2D figure).

- A wharf at Cadi Park will not feel or be safe to women or vulnerable people compared to a busy area.

- This location is surrounded by low-rise residential apartments and hundreds of metres from office buildings that require commuting.

- In contrast, the existing Pirrama Wharf would attract more users (i.e. revenue for sustainability, and business and community benefit, require no new infrastructure and continue from the Harris St ridgeline. Expanding the role of Pirrama Wharf would be consistent with Figure 23 for Pyrmont Village.

- A bus stop on Bowman St also will be a deterrent and safety risk for cyclists, for whom this is a popular daily route. (Wiggling through a public park popular with families and groups (Waterfront Park - where there is no such cycling path today), around on Refinery Dr and a narrow laneway is no alternative for commuting cyclists and detrimental to passive recreation in this area.) Buses and cyclists intrinsically compete for the left side of roads: the former to pick up passengers and the latter out of the way of cars.

2. Exhibition Discussion Paper Figure 23 and p25, Report p97. The proposed cycle lane along Jones Street Between Broadway and Wentworth Park light rail stop will not work in three dimensions and with the existing public transport. Once a cyclist reaches the end of Jones St, they must use a lift (often out of action or soiled) or a long ramp down to station level, wheel bikes along one platform then through a maze of ramps or two platforms then a narrow path. They face no safe exit either to Wattle St or Pyrmont Bridge Road. Contrary to the image in Figure 23, it is far from a straight arrow at the end of Jones Street down to Pyrmont Bridge Road. Nor does the diagram on p97 or p102 of the Report deal with what a cyclist does, in practice, in three dimensions of the landscape with major height differences and not the two of a diagram.

3. Exhibition Discussion Paper Figure 21, Report p50 re Bunn St. It is imperative that improvements around Harbourside and to its south markedly improve the ability of pedestrians and cyclists to cross the light rail line and Darling Drive at multiple points. Guardian Sq does not address these needs. The crossings over the light rail platforms on Darling Dr should be streamlined, which can be easily done (in fact, one such direct access was removed only a few years ago). The COVID pandemic has shown that congestion like that, and the crossing near Allen St, is not only inconvenient, annoying and discouraging - it is also risky to public health.

In addition, Exhibition Discussion Paper Figures 5 and 6 appear to be unexplained regarding changes to buildings on Bowman St. These are in a highly functioning community, home to major global businesses, follow well designed slopes down to the water (implication for views, Report p30) and are innocuous for the large number of people who also take passive recreation in this area. These are also new buildings, one of which has only been completed in the last few years.

I agree to the above statement

Yes

